

REMARKS

Claims 1-3 and 5-28 are currently pending in this application. Applicant notes the recognition of allowable subject matter in claims 16 and 20. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the rejections- in light of the following remarks.

§ 102 Rejection of the Claims

Claims 1 and 3 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102 by Gehrke, U.S. Patent No. 1,932,817. Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

In the Response to Arguments in the December 20, 2006 Office Action, it is noted that it is believed that “Gehrke discloses a condenser for film projectors thus includes an image forming device” (Page 9, December 20, 2006 Office Action). Applicant respectfully disagrees with this and respectfully asserts that Gehrke does not disclose an image forming device.

Gehrke relates to projectors for exhibiting cinematograph pictures (Gehrke, page 1, line 1-3), or in other words to movie projectors. Movie projectors function by projecting an image of the film to a viewing screen using a lens system (of which the condenser in Gehrke could be part). Therefore, Gehrke does not disclose an image forming device because the image, from the film or movie itself, is merely projected onto the screen.

Because Gehrke does not disclose every element of claim 1, it does not anticipate claim 1. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that this rejection be withdrawn. Applicant also notes that there may be other reasons why independent claim 1 is not anticipated by Gehrke, and independent reasons why claim 3 is not anticipated by Gehrke; Applicant does not concede those arguments by not presenting them here.

Claims 11, 14, 15, and 17 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102 by Ryan, U.S. Patent No. 1,428,662. Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

The Response to Arguments in the December 20, 2006 Office Action states that Applicant has not clearly pointed out what features of the meniscus lens are different or advantageous over the lenses of Ryan. Applicant respectfully disagrees that such statements are necessary to show that Ryan does not anticipate claims 11, 14, 15, and 17. In order to anticipate a claim, a single reference must disclose each element of the rejected claim. Claims 11 and 15

recite that “all first meniscus lenses have substantially the same shape and size and all second meniscus lenses have substantially the same shape and size”. The lens sets of Ryan (lenses 15 and 16; and lenses 18 and 19) have two different purposes. The outer lenses of the two sets, lenses 16 and 19, have different purposes, and are constructed for those different purposes. Lens 16 “is for the purpose of concentrating the light received from the lens 15 and projecting it, in a long and relatively narrow beam, forwardly the headlight, and is **constructed** and positioned, with relation to the lens 15 for that purpose” (Ryan, page 1, lines 62-68, emphasis added). Contrary to that, lens 19 “is for the purpose of receiving the rays from the lens 18, and dispersing them in front of the headlight, **but unlike lens 16, it is not designed to project a long, narrow beam of light but a wider beam and nearer to the headlight, and the lens 19 is positioned and formed for that purpose**” (Ryan, page 1, lines 82-89, emphasis added). The specific differences between lens 16 and lens 19 to produce the different effects would be known to one of skill in the art, and are not relevant to the anticipation rejection. The statement that the lenses are “positioned and formed” for two different purposes is relevant to the anticipation rejection because it shows that Ryan does not anticipate the rejected claims.

Because Ryan fails to disclose all of the elements of claims 11, and 15, it fails to anticipate claims 11, 14, 15, and 17. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that this rejection be withdrawn. Applicant notes that there may be other reasons why claims 11 and 15 are not anticipated by Ryan, and independent reasons why claims 14, and 17 are not anticipated by Ryan. Applicant does not concede those arguments by not presenting them herein.

§ 103 Rejection of the Claims

Claim 2 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 by Gehrke, U.S. Patent No. 1,932,817, in view of Wolfe, U.S. Patent No. 1,900,966. Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

Applicant reiterates the comments offered above with respect to Gehrke, and respectfully submits that Wolfe fails to remedy the shortcomings of Gehrke. Wolfe is also related to a projection system where no image is formed, but a previously formed image is instead projected. Because the combination of Gehrke and Wolfe fail to disclose or suggest all of the elements of claim 1, and thereby claim 2 which is dependent thereon, Gehrke and Wolfe do not render claim 2 obvious. Applicant respectfully requests that this rejection be withdrawn. Applicant also notes

that there may be other reasons why claim 1 is not obvious over Gehrke and Wolfe and independent reasons why claim 2 is not obvious over Gehrke and Wolfe. Applicant does not concede those arguments by not presenting them herein.

Claim 5-10 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 by Gehrke, U.S. Patent No. 1,932,817, in view of Hanano, U.S. Patent Publication No. 2004/0062044. Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

Applicant reiterates the comments offered above with respect to Gehrke, and respectfully submits that Hannao fails to remedy the shortcomings of Gehrke. Because the combination of Gehrke and Hannao fail to disclose or suggest all of the elements of claim 1, and thereby claims 5-10 which are dependent thereon, Gehrke and Hannao do not render claims 5-10 obvious. Applicant respectfully requests that this rejection be withdrawn. Applicant also notes that there may be other reasons why claim 1 is not obvious over Gehrke and Hannao and independent reasons why claims 5-10 are not obvious over Gehrke and Hannao. Applicant does not concede those arguments by not presenting them herein.

Claim 12 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 by Ryan, U.S. Patent No. 1,428,662, in view of Wolfe, U.S. Patent No. 1,900,966. Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

Applicant reiterates the comments offered above with respect to Ryan, and respectfully submits that Wolfe fails to remedy the shortcomings of Ryan. Wolfe only discloses one set of lenses, and is therefore silent with respect to relative sizes of two sets of lenses. Because the combination of Ryan and Wolfe fail to disclose or suggest all of the elements of claim 11, and thereby claim 12 which is dependent thereon, Ryan and Wolfe do not render claim 12 obvious. Applicant respectfully requests that this rejection be withdrawn. Applicant also notes that there may be other reasons why claim 11 is not obvious over Ryan and Wolfe and independent reasons why claim 12 is not obvious over Ryan and Wolfe. Applicant does not concede those arguments by not presenting them herein.

Claim 13 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 by Ryan, U.S. Patent No. 1,428,662. Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

Applicant reiterates the comments offered above with respect to Ryan not disclosing all of the elements of claim 11 (on which claim 13 is dependent). Specifically, Ryan does not disclose “all first meniscus lenses have substantially the same shape and size and all second meniscus lenses have substantially the same shape and size”. Applicant also submits that Ryan would not suggest such a modification because it would defeat the purpose of Ryan, in that the purpose of Ryan is realized by having the two sets of lenses provide different functions. Based at least on these comments, Applicant respectfully requests that this rejection be withdrawn. Applicant also notes that there may be other reasons why claim 11 is not obvious over Ryan, and independent reasons why claim 13 is not obvious over Ryan. Applicant does not concede those arguments by not presenting them herein.

Claim 18, 19, and 21-27 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 by Ryan, U.S. Patent No. 1,428,662, in view of Hanano, U.S. Patent Publication No. 2004/0062044. Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

Applicant reiterates the comments offered above with respect to Ryan, and respectfully submits that Hannon fails to remedy the shortcomings of Ryan. Hannon only discloses one set of lenses, and is therefore silent with respect to relative sizes of two sets of lenses. Because the combination of Ryan and Hannon fail to disclose or suggest all of the elements of claim 15, and thereby claims 18, 19, and 21-27 which are dependent thereon, Ryan and Hannon do not render claims 18, 19, and 21-27 obvious. Applicant respectfully requests that this rejection be withdrawn. Applicant also notes that there may be other reasons why claim 15 is not obvious over Ryan and Hannon and independent reasons why claims 18, 19, and 21-27 are not obvious over Ryan and Hannon. Applicant does not concede those arguments by not presenting them herein.

Claim 28 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 by Gehrke, U.S. Patent No. 1,932,817, in view of Lammers, U.S. Patent No. 6,478,453. Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

Applicant reiterates the comments offered above with respect to Gehrke, and respectfully submits that Lammers fails to remedy the shortcomings of Gehrke. Lammers is also related to a system for projecting an image (abstract). Because the combination of Gehrke and Lammers fail

to disclose or suggest all of the elements of claim 1, and thereby claim 28 which is dependent thereon, Gehrke and Lammers do not render claim 28 obvious. Applicant respectfully requests that this rejection be withdrawn. Applicant also notes that there may be other reasons why claim 1 is not obvious over Gehrke and Lammers and independent reasons why claim 28 is not obvious over Gehrke and Lammers. Applicant does not concede those arguments by not presenting them herein.

Conclusion

Applicant also notes that there may be other arguments which were not presented herein, and Applicant does not concede those arguments by not having presented them herein. Applicant also does not necessarily agree with the correctness of statements made in the Office Action that were not rebutted herein.

In view of the foregoing amendments, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and allowance of the claims as all rejections have been overcome. Early notice of allowability is kindly requested.

The Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned by telephone at 651-733-6750 with any questions or comments.

Please grant any extension of time, if necessary for entry of this paper, and charge any fee due for such extension or any other fee required in connection with this paper to Deposit Account No. 13-3723

Fees


- ☒ Please charge any additional fees associated with the prosecution of this application to Deposit Account No. 13-3723. This authorization includes the fee for any necessary extension of time under 37 CFR § 1.136(a). To the extent any such extension should become necessary, it is hereby requested.
- ☒ Please credit any overpayment to the same deposit account.

Respectfully submitted,

Date

March 19, 2007

By

Jay R. Pralle, Reg. No.: 52,131
Telephone No.: 651-733-6750

Office of Intellectual Property Counsel
3M Innovative Properties Company
Facsimile No.: 651-736-3833